



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,997	10/16/2003	Hyesook Kim	3087.00012	7448
7590	09/20/2005			EXAMINER
Amy E. Rinaldo Kohn & Associates, PLLC Suite 410 30500 Northwestern Highway Farmington Hills, MI 48334			HOGE, GARY CHAPMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3611	
DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/686,997	KIM, HYESOOK
	Examiner Gary C. Hoge	Art Unit 3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 21-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/16/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I and Species I in the replies filed on March 14, 2005 and July 6, 2005, respectively, is acknowledged. The traversal of the restriction of inventions is on the ground(s) that "since all of the claims relate to the organization of samples, it is entirely reasonable, and would not present an undue burden upon the Examiner, for the claims of all the groups to be maintained in a single application". This is not found persuasive because Group II is directed to barcode software combined with word processing software. Nothing whatsoever relating to the organization of samples is claimed. The traversal of the restriction of species is on the ground(s) that "examination of all of the species in a single application would be efficient." This is not found persuasive because examining Species II would require searching the refrigeration art, a search that is not required for Species I.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 10 and 21-25 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the replies filed on March 14, 2005 and July 6, 2005.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-3 and 19 objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 6, it appears that "a" should be deleted.

In claims 2 and 3, "identifier" has been misspelled.

In claim 19, line 7, it appears that "a" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 4, 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, it is impossible for the spreadsheet to be identical to the marked grid, for they are separate and distinct items. It is suggested that "is identical" be changed to "corresponds to," or words to that effect.

Regarding claim 13, it is not understood how a two-dimensional spreadsheet can produce a barcode system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-8, 10, 14-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glover (2002/0116845).

Glover discloses a marked grid including specific locations 16 and a spreadsheet 22 including designations relating to the locations on the marked grid, such that each of the

designations includes details regarding items located in each of the locations. The spreadsheet is two-dimensional.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, see paragraph 0016.

Regarding claims 4, 5 and 16-18, see paragraph 0018.

Regarding claim 6, see paragraph 0014.

Regarding claim 10, storage container 12 fits the dictionary definition of a "rack."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glover (2002/0116845) in view of MacWilliams et al. (6,352,286).

Glover discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, the indicia on the grid and the spreadsheet does not include a barcode. MacWilliams teaches that it was known in the art to include a barcode along with other identifying indicia, in order to make the indicia machine-readable. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a barcode along with the other indicia disclosed by Glover, as taught by MacWilliams, in order to make the indicia machine-readable.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3611

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary C. Hoge whose telephone number is (571) 272-6645. The examiner can normally be reached on 5-4-9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (571) 272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Gary C Hoge
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3611

gch